

**Appl. No. 10/691,744
Amdt. dated July 24, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of April 26, 2006**

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants received the Final Office Action dated April 26, 2006, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1, 5-10, 14-18 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Carn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,138,611, hereinafter "Carn"); 2) rejected claims 1, 5-10, 14-18 and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Elwalid et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,616, hereinafter "Elwalid"); and 3) rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horst et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,867,501, hereinafter "Horst") in further view of Sindhu et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,924,119, hereinafter "Sindhu"). With this Response, Applicants amend claims 1, 10, and 25. Based on the arguments and amendment contained herein, Applicants believe this case to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 previously required a "separate timer" in the second processor. The Examiner appears to have taken the position that the separate timer in the second processor is a timer that is "separate" from the "at least one timer" in the first processor. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the second processor comprises "a plurality of timers, each being associated with a different message type" and each such timer expires under a certain claimed condition. Neither Carn nor Elwalid discloses such a feature. Claim 10 has been amended in a similar fashion to claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants believe that independent claims 1 and 10 and their associated dependent claims are not anticipated by, nor rendered obvious over, Carn and Elwalid. No other art of record satisfies the deficiencies of Carn and Elwalid.


Applicants amend claim 25 to require that the claimed timers are reset and expire based upon certain conditions as set forth in the claim. As explained above, neither Carn nor Elwalid discloses having multiple timers in a processor associated with different message types. The Examiner also alleges that the combination of Horst and Sindhu renders claim 25 obvious. Neither Horst nor Sindhu, however, teach or suggest a timer in a processor that expires when that particular processor fails to send a message of a certain type in a predetermined

Appl. No. 10/691,744
Amdt. dated July 24, 2006
Reply to Final Office Action of April 26, 2006

amount of time. In Horst, a timer is used in a processor to determine whether the processor has received a reply to a previously sent message. This teaching is substantially different than a timer that expires when its processor fails to send a message within a given timer period. For these reasons, Applicants believe that claim 25 and all claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,


Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400